

REMARKS

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claim 10 was objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended claim 10 to correct the informalities as required by the Examiner.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C § 101

Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office action states, “Merely claiming nonfunctional descriptive material stored in a computer-readable medium does not make it statutory.” In response, Applicant has amended claim 10 to recite functional material and submits that claim 10, as amended, meets the statutory requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C § 112

Claims 1, 8, 9, 11, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner cites limitations in claims 1, 8, 9, 11, and 20 as lacking antecedent basis. In response, Applicant has amended claims 1, 8, 9, 11, and 20 to include proper antecedent basis. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 8, 9, 11, and 20, as amended, comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C § 102

Claims 1-3 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,269,402 issued to Lin et al. (*Lin*). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-3 and 10 are not anticipated by *Lin* for at least the reasons described below.

Independent Claims 1 and 10

Independent claim 1 recites, in part, the following:

selectively generating a communication session identifier to uniquely identify the communication session from a plurality of communication sessions supported by the network access server **to enable an enhanced point-to-point communication protocol within a point-to-point communication session between the basestation and the network access server.**

As highlighted, claim 1 recites a communication session identifier to enable an enhanced point-to-point communication protocol within a point-to-point communication session between the basestation and the network access server. Independent claim 10 recites similar limitations.

The Office action cites *Lin* as teaching the limitations of claim 1. The cited portion of *Lin* discusses generating a session identifier in response to a request from a mobile client. See column 4, lines 13-17. However, *Lin* does not teach or disclose selectively generating a communication session identifier **to enable an enhanced point-to-point communication protocol within a point-to-point communication session between the basestation and the network access server**, as claimed by Applicant. Thus, *Lin* fails to teach or disclose at least one limitation recited in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits claims 1 and 10 are not anticipated by *Lin*.

Claims 2-3 depend from claim 1. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-3 are not anticipated by *Lin* for at least the reasons described above.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C § 103

Dependent Claim 4

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lin* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0053694 attributed to Igarashi et al. (*Igarashi*).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4 is not rendered obvious by *Lin* in view of *Igarashi* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1. Dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend. As discussed above, *Lin* fails to teach or disclose selectively generating a communication session identifier to enable an enhanced point-to-point communication protocol within a point-to-point communication session between the basestation and the network access server as claimed by Applicant. *Igarashi* is cited as teaching analyzing attribute-value pairs of the received incoming call request to identify a callType AVP. Whether or not *Igarashi* teaches the limitations cited in the Office action, *Igarashi* does not teach or disclose selectively generating a communication session identifier to enable an enhanced point-to-point communication protocol within a point-to-point communication session between the basestation and the network access server. Thus, *Igarashi* fails to cure deficiencies of *Lin*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits claim 4 is not obvious in view of *Lin* and *Igarashi*.

Claims 11-13, 16-18, 20-21, and 23-24

Claims 11-13, 16-18, 20-21, and 23-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lin* in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0012149 attributed to Maggenti et al. (*Maggenti*). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11-13, 16-18, 20-

21, and 23-24 are not rendered obvious by *Lin* in view of *Maggenti* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Independent claim 11 recites, in part, the following:

a communications agent, to selectively generate a communication session identifier to uniquely identify the point-to-point communication session from a plurality of communication sessions supported by the apparatus **to enable an enhanced point-to-point communication protocol within the point-to-point communication session between the basestation and the network access server.**

As highlighted, claim 11 recites a communications agent to enable an enhanced point-to-point communication protocol within the point-to-point communication session between the basestation and the network access server. Independent claim 20 recites similar limitations.

As discussed previously, *Lin* fails to teach or disclose **to enable an enhanced point-to-point communication protocol within a point-to-point communication session between the basestation and the network access server.** *Maggenti* is cited as teaching a communications agent. Whether or not *Maggenti* teaches the limitations cited in the Office action, *Maggenti* does not teach or disclose to enable an enhanced point-to-point communication protocol within a point-to-point communication session between the basestation and the network access server as claimed by Applicant. Thus, *Maggenti* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Lin*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits claims 11 and 20 are not obvious in view of *Lin* and *Maggenti*.

Claims 12-13, and 16-18 depend from claim 11. Claims 21, and 23-24 depend from claim 20. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicant respectfully submits claims 12-13, 16-18, 21, and 23-24 are not obvious in view of *Lin* and *Maggenti*.

Dependent Claims 5-9 and 19

Claims 5-9 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lin* in view of *Maggenti* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,006,266 issued to Murphy, Jr. et al. (*Murphy*). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5-9 are not rendered obvious by *Lin* in view of *Maggenti* and further in view of *Murphy* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claims 5-9 depend from claim 1. Claim 19 depends from claim 11. Dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend. As discussed above, *Lin* fails to teach or disclose at least one limitation of claims 1 and 11. *Maggenti* is cited as teaching composing a random element of the communication session identifier. *Murphy* is cited as teaching employing a mathematical function to generate the communication session identifier. Both *Maggenti* and *Murphy* fail to cure the deficiencies of *Lin*. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 5-9 and 19 are not obvious in view of *Lin*, *Maggenti*, and *Murphy*.

Claims 14 and 15

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lin* in view of *Maggenti* and further in view of *Igarashi*. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 14 and 15 are not rendered obvious by *Lin* in view of *Maggenti* and further in view of *Igarashi* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 11. As discussed above, the combination of *Lin* and *Maggenti* fail to teach at least one limitation of independent claim 11. *Igarashi* is cited as teaching analyzing attribute-value pairs of a received incoming call request control command to identify a callType AVP. Whether or not *Igarashi* actually teaches the

limitations cited in the Office action, *Igarashi* does not teach or disclose to enable an enhanced point-to-point communication protocol within a point-to-point communication session between the basestation and the network access server as recited in claim 11. Thus, *Igarashi* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Lin* and *Maggenti*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits claims 14 and 15 are not rendered obvious by *Lin* in view of *Maggenti* and further in view of *Igarashi*.

Claim 22

Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lin* in view of *Murphy*. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 22 are not rendered obvious by *Lin* in view of *Murphy* for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claim 22 depends from claim 20. As discussed above, *Lin* fails to teach at least one limitation of claim 20. Also discussed above, *Murphy* does not cure the deficiencies of *Lin*. Therefore, Applicant submits claim 22 is not obvious in view of *Lin* and *Murphy*.

New Claims 25-31

Claims 25-31 have been added. Applicant submits that these claims are patentable over the references discussed above. Specifically, independent claim 25 recites determining whether a request to establish and end-to-end network communication session includes a recognized communication session ID, an unrecognized communication session ID, or no communication session ID. The cited references do not teach or disclose these limitations. Claims 26-31 depend from claim 25. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 25-31 are patentable over the references cited in the Office action.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-31 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 3/5/05



Gregory D. Caldwell
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 39,926

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200

GDC/jse